

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 4-25 have been amended. Support for the amended claims can be found, at least, in Figs. 5 and 6 and [0002] of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the claim amendments of the April 23 Amendment After Final Rejection (AAFR) overcame the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 12-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0232510 to Blake et al. ("Blake"). Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Blake in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0089212 to Mashitani et al. ("Mashitani"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the AAFR Applicants argued that claim 1 recites a method for generating a stereoscopic image having a left image and a right image for stereoscopic vision. The stereoscopic image of claim 1 contains both a right and a left image. In other words, the final product (the stereoscopic image) is two images, modified in such a manner as to allow a user, when perceiving both together to see a single three dimensional image. The remaining independent claims recite the same feature. By contrast, Blake discloses a system for creating a single image, from input from two cameras. See [0028] of Blake. Thus, Blake does not disclose generating two images as recited in claim 1.

In response, the Advisory Action makes two rebuttal assertions, presented here out of order. First, that claim 1 recited generating a stereoscopic image (singular). Second, that Blake does disclose generating two images.

In response to the first assertion, claim 1, as amended, now recites "generating a stereoscopic image set of images" (emphasis added). Thus, claim 1 recites that two images must be generated and must remain as the final product.

In response to the second assertion, Applicants respectfully renew their previous argument that Blake only discloses generating two images as a transient state towards its final goal of generating a single image. As explained in the AAFR, in Blake, the problem relates to allowing a user in, for example, a teleconference to be seen as staring straight into a camera, even when the camera may be positioned off axis from the person. See [0025] of Blake. Blake discloses a solution, in which two cameras both provide images of the person. Blake then discloses synthesizing these images into a single image (the virtual image 116). See [0028] of Blake, stating "it should be understood that cyclopean refers to the single virtual image" (emphasis added).

Because Blake does not maintain two images as its final product, Blake does not disclose the "removed region processing step." Claim 1, recites that the result of the removed region processing step is a set of images. Thus, after the removed region is extracted two images still remain. By contrast, Blake explicitly discloses that after its synthesis step only a single image remains. See [0025]-[0028] of Blake. Thus, Blake does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1, as amended.

Furthermore, as explained in the AAFR, it would not be obvious to modify Blake to create two images. Blake has no interest in keeping the two images it creates as separate images. To the contrary, Blake explicitly states that it desires to create a single image that can be projected on, for example, a teleconference screen. Thus, it would also not be obvious to modify Blake to disclose the method of claim 1, or the other independent claims that recite substantially the same features as claim 1.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4-25 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky  
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MKW/jfb

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 26, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461